



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/651,104	08/29/2003	Ik-Soo Kim	8733.432.20	7746
30827	7590	10/14/2005	EXAMINER	
MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP 1900 K STREET, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20006			DI GRAZIO, JEANNE A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2871	

DATE MAILED: 10/14/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/651,104	KIM, IK-SOO
	Examiner Jeanne A. Di Grazio	Art Unit 2871

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on RCE July 21, 2005.

2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 29,31,33-38,40 and 42-46 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) 47 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 29,31,33-38,40 and 42-46 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on 29 August 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/860,590.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Status of Claims***

Per Preliminary Amendment filed August 29, 2003, claims 1-28 have been cancelled.

Claim 47 has previously been withdrawn from further consideration per Applicant's election without traverse of Species B, second preferred embodiment (Figure 13) claims 29-46 readable thereon in the reply filed on July 2, 2004.

Applicant has amended claims 29, 31, 33-35, 37, 40, 42 and 44-45 per Amendment dated June 21, 2005.

Applicant has cancelled claims 30, 32, 39 and 41 per Amendment of June 21, 2005.

Claims 29, 31, 33-38, 40 and 42-46 remain pending.

***Priority***

Priority to Korean Patent Application No. 2000-27850 (May 23, 2000) is claimed.

Continuation of Application No. 09/860,590 filed on May 21, 2001 now United States Patent 6,661,492.

***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 21, 2005 has been entered.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 29, 31, 33, 34, 37, 38, 40 and 42-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent 6,351,300 B1 (to Park et al.) in view of United States Patent 6,014,190 (to Kim et al.) and further in view of United States Patent 6,122,030 (to Nagata et al.).

As to claim 29 (amended), Park teaches and discloses an LCD having a high transmittance and manufacturing method and Park has the following elements. Park has, referring to Figures 2 and 3, a lower substrate (40) and an upper substrate (60), gate bus lines (41a and 41b) and a common signal line (42) on the lower substrate (40), data bus lines (47a and 47b) perpendicular to the gate bus lines (41a and 41 b), a thin film transistor (50) at a crossing

point of the gate (41a and 41b) and data (47a and 47b) bus lines, the thin film transistor (50) including a source electrode (48), a drain electrode (49) and a gate electrode (45), a gate insulating layer (44) over the gate bus lines (41a and 41b), an intermetal insulating layer (80) (= “second insulating layer”) is deposited over the gate insulating layer (44) over the lower substrate (40), pixel electrodes (46) on the intermetal layer (80) (=“second insulating layer”), counter electrodes (43) on the intermetal layer (= “second insulating layer”), wherein the counter electrodes (43) and the pixel electrodes (46) form an alternating pattern (Figure 2), the counter electrodes (43) including an outermost counter electrode (43b) adjacent to a data bus line (47a and 47b), and a liquid crystal layer (65) between the lower and upper substrates (40 and 60 in Figure 3).

Please note that the pixel electrodes and the counter electrodes are transparent (See, e.g., Column 9, Lines 9-15).

Please also note that, in reference to Figure 2, a pixel electrode body (=auxiliary pixel electrode) is connected to the drain electrode through a contact hole (drain electrode 49)(See also Column 4, Lines 1-10 ; Column 4, Lines 65-67 ; Column 5, Lines 1-5).

The pixel electrode body is an extension of the pixel electrode and thus they (pixel electrode body and pixel electrode) are both formed on the intermetal layer (Applicant’s “an auxiliary pixel electrode on the second insulating layer and connected to the drain electrode through a contact hole in the second insulating layer”).

Park does not appear to explicitly specify that the outermost counter electrode and the data bus line are on different layer and wherein a portion of the outermost counter electrode overlaps the data bus line.

Kim teaches and discloses an in-plane switching liquid crystal display and manufacturing method (Title, entire patent). With reference to Figure 3, Kim teaches transparent common electrodes (121) that are arranged within a column. An outermost common electrode (the first common electrode at the very top of Figure 3) overlaps with a data line (130). Specifically, the data line overlaps with the common electrodes in a column and edges of the data line lie within the width of the common electrodes. Furthermore, the common electrodes have openings (20) to prevent the signal flowing along the data line from disturbing the signal from the common electrodes (Column 5, Lines 45-60) (Applicant's "a portion of the outermost common electrode overlaps the data line"). The common electrodes and the data line being overlapped are on different layers (Column 3, Lines 28-36).

Kim teaches that because the data line and common electrode overlap, the electric fields due to the potential difference between the data line and the common electrodes are vertical and thus the fields rarely disturb the liquid crystal molecules particularly when the width of the common electrode is larger than that of the data line (Kim, Column 5, Lines 55-60).

Kim is evidence that ordinary workers in the field of liquid crystals would have found the reason, suggestion and motivation to overlap a data line and common electrode so that liquid crystal molecules would not be disturbed by electric fields generated from the potential difference of the data line and common electrode.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of liquid crystals at the time the invention was made to modify Park in view of Kim so as not disrupt liquid crystal molecules due to the potential difference between the data line and the common electrode and for a high aperture ratio device (Column 5, Lines 55-60 and Column 6, Lines 16-21).

Park does not appear to explicitly specify that the second insulating layer is made of an organic material.

Nagata teaches and discloses an insulating film layer and sealant arrangement for protective circuit devices in a liquid crystal display device (Title, entire patent) wherein an insulating film of an organic material is preferred in order to prevent longitudinal crosstalk (Column 1, Lines 60-67 and Column 2, Lines 1-8).

Nagata is evidence that ordinary workers in the field of liquid crystals would have found the reason, suggestion and motivation to incorporate an organic material for the second insulating layer to prevent longitudinal crosstalk.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of liquid crystals at the time the invention was made to modify Park in view of Nagata to prevent longitudinal crosstalk.

As to claim 31, the pixel electrodes are made of indium tin oxide (ITO) (Park, Column 9, Lines 9-15).

As to claim 33, the common electrodes are made of indium tin oxide (ITO) (Park, Column 9, Lines 9-15).

As to claim 34, Park also shows an auxiliary common electrode (Figures 8 and 13, reference number 315) on the second insulating substrate.

As to claims 37, 38, 40 and 42-44, the method steps of fabricating an in-plane switching liquid crystal display device would have been obvious in view of the structures and devices as taught by Park in view of Kim and Nagata.

Claims 35 and 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent 6,351,300 B1 (to Park et al.) in view of United States Patent 6,014,190 (to Kim et al.) and further in view of United States Patent 6,122,030 (to Nagata et al.) and further in view of United States Patent 6,414,729 B1 (to Akiyama et al.).

As to claim 35, Park does not appear to explicitly specify an auxiliary pixel electrode contacting the pixel electrodes.

Akiyama teaches and discloses a liquid crystal display device having stacked pixel layers wherein an electrode of an auxiliary capacity electrode for a sub-pixel is connected to pixel electrodes (Column 7, Lines 46-48) and this structure contributes to shielding of the liquid crystal layers from scanning and signal lines (Column 2, Lines 15-25).

Akiyama is evidence that ordinary workers in the field of liquid crystals would have found the reason, suggestion and motivation to specify an auxiliary pixel electrode contacting the pixel electrodes to shield liquid crystal layers from scanning and signal lines.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of liquid crystals at the time the invention was made to modify Park in view of Akiyama to shield liquid crystal from scanning and signal lines.

As to claim 45, the method step of forming an auxiliary pixel electrode contacting the pixel electrodes would have been obvious in view of the structures and devices as taught by Park in view of Kim and Nagata and Akiyama.

Claims 36 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent 6,351,300 B1 (to Park et al.) in view of United States Patent 6,014,190 (to Kim et

al.) and further in view of United States Patent 6,122,030 (to Nagata et al.) and further in view of United States Patent 5,680,190 (to Michibayashi et al.).

As to claim 36, Park does not appear to explicitly specify a capacitor electrode electrically connected with the pixel electrodes.

Michibayashi teaches and discloses a liquid crystal display in which three pixel electrodes are connected to each other through a capacitor for an enlarged view angle (Column 1, Lines 18-40).

Michibayashi is evidence that ordinary workers in the field of liquid crystals would have found the reason, suggestion and motivation to electrically connect a capacitor electrode with pixel electrodes for enlarged view angle.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art of liquid crystals at the time the invention was made to modify Park in view of Michibayashi for enlarged view angle.

As to claim 46, the method step of forming a capacitor electrode electrically connected with the pixel electrodes would have been obvious in view of the structures and devices as taught and disclosed by Park in view of Kim and Nagata and Michibayashi.

#### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed December 16, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant's only argument is as follows:

Applicant argues that “neither Park, Kim nor Nagata, analyzed alone or in any combination, teaches or suggests … ‘transparent pixel electrodes on the second insulating layer; transparent common electrodes on the second insulating layer, … and auxiliary pixel electrode on the second insulating layer and connected to the drain electrode through a contact hole in the second insulating layer.” (See Remarks generally at page 7).

It is respectfully noted that Park teaches and discloses that the pixel electrodes and the counter electrodes are transparent (See, e.g., Column 9, Lines 9-15). Please also note that, in reference to Figure 2, a pixel electrode body (=auxiliary pixel electrode) is connected to the drain electrode through a contact hole (drain electrode 49)(See also Column 4, Lines 1-10 ; Column 4, Lines 65-67 ; Column 5, Lines 1-5).

The pixel electrode body is an extension of the pixel electrode and thus they (pixel electrode body and pixel electrode) are both formed on the intermetal layer (Applicant’s “an auxiliary pixel electrode on the second insulating layer and connected to the drain electrode through a contact hole in the second insulating layer”).

It is respectfully noted that Applicant’s Figures (in particular, Figures 8 and 13) show the auxiliary pixel electrode as a bottom branch of the pixel electrode. See Figure 8 where the auxiliary pixel electrode (410) is the base portion from which ‘teeth’ extend into pixels (400). Figure 13 also shows the same feature.

*Conclusion*

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeanne A. Di Grazio whose telephone number is (571)272-2289. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert Kim, can be reached on (571)272-2293. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jeanne Andrea Di Grazio  
Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 2871

JDG

*Andrew Schechter*  
ANDREW SCHECHTER  
PRIMARY EXAMINER